

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are pending in the application. The restricted claims 3-8 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Figs. 1 and 4 are objected to as requiring the legend of prior art. Enclosed are substitute formal Figs. 1 and 4 having been designated with the legend "Prior Art".

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify the structure of the housing and shoulder parts of the pins. Also this clarifies the structure of the shoulder part pressers previously described in claim 2. This clarification of the claims is based on the description on applicant's specification, for example, page 10, lines 16-29. No new matter is entered.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Dixon et al. (Dixon) and claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Dixon in view of the Admitted prior art.

With regard to claim 1 the Office Action asserts Dixon, Fig. 7 shows the pins 12 with shoulder parts 28 forced into the through holes 32 having gaps 24 formed between the shoulder parts and the inner walls of the through holes.

In applicant's claim 1, the shoulder parts are formed in such a way that upon being secured in the housing, gaps are formed between the shoulder parts and inner walls of the through-hole. The combination of the housing and pins secured in the housing are configured to receive the end of the shoulder part presser of the housing remover tool.

Dixon fails to disclose or suggest the shoulder and gap adopted to be being removed by a housing remover tool with shoulder part pressers each having a hollow part for receiving the pin part and a cut-away part at an end thereof for engaging with the shoulder part.

Dixon does not suggest this arraignment since the only description is in col. 4, lines 3-14 which describes the stabilizing projections have a small contact area with the walls and thereby recites that bowing effect is reduced.

Because Dixon does not describe nor suggest each feature of applicant's claimed invention it is respectfully requested the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is rejected as being unpatentable over Dixon in view of the admitted prior art.


Applicant's claim 2 is dependent from claim 1 and should likewise be in condition for allowance since neither Dixon or the Admitted prior art suggests the shoulder and gap adopted to be being removed by a housing remover tool.

Applicant's combination of unique structures accords the advantage over the prior art of allowing defective terminal(s) to be individually replaced or repaired easily.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585
(212) 940-8703
Docket No.: FUJI 19.371 (100794-00161)
BSM:fd